

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request that the foregoing amendments be made prior to examination of the present application.

Claims 1, 23, 35, 46, 53, 61, 67, 81, and 86 are currently being amended. No new matter is added.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate status identifier for each claim.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1, 3-23, 25-36, 38-46, 48-54, 56-71, and 73-96 are pending in this application.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

- a. **Rejection of claims 1, 3-4, 7-19, 23, 25, 29-30, 32-33, 35, 38, 41-44, 46, 48, 51, 53, 56-59, 61-62, 64-65, 67-69, 71, 73, 78-82, 86, 88-90, and 93-94 based on Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al.**

In section 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3-4, 7-19, 23, 25, 29-30, 32-33, 35, 38, 41-44, 46, 48, 51, 53, 56-59, 61-62, 64-65, 67-69, 71, 73, 78-82, 86, 88-90, and 93-94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakiraman et al. (U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/0124020) in view of Jamtgaard et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,430,624).

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claims 1, 3-4, 7-19, 23, 25, 29-30, 32-33, 35, 38, 41-44, 46, 48, 51, 53, 56-59, 61-62, 64-65, 67-69, 71, 73, 78-82, 86, 88-90, and 93-94. To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art (see M.P.E.P. § 2143.03). Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. and Jamtgaard et al. fails to teach or suggest at least one limitation of each of claims 1, 3-4, 7-19, 23, 25, 29-30, 32-33, 35, 38, 41-44, 46, 48, 51, 53, 56-59, 61-62, 64-65, 67-69, 71, 73, 78-82, 86, 88-90, and 93-94.

**i. Claims 1, 3-4, and 7-19**

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the steps of claim 1 as combined therein. Specifically, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. fails to teach or suggest “wherein the transfer instruction includes an instruction to send the electronic data if the electronic data has a supported format, and wherein the transfer function includes an instruction not to send the electronic data if the electronic data does not have a supported format” as included in the combination of steps of claim 1 as amended. Janakiraman et al. teaches extracting text equivalents for multimedia content and streaming them to a web browser when possible, but appears to be silent as to transferring the multimedia content itself. Jamtgaard et al. teaches converting data from an internet provider’s website to a format that is customized to an information appliance 15 (see Jamtgaard et al., col. 4, lines 58-66). Thus, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest “wherein the transfer instruction includes an instruction to send the electronic data if the electronic data has a supported format, and wherein the transfer function includes an instruction not to send the electronic data if the electronic data does not have a supported format” as included in the combination of steps of claim 1 as amended. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 3-4 and 7-19 depend from claim 1 and are thus patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. and Jamtgaard et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and Applicants further request that the rejection of claims 3-4 and 7-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn as well.

**ii. Claims 23, 25, 29-30, and 32-33**

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the steps of claim 23 as combined therein. Specifically, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. fails to teach or suggest “wirelessly transmitting the filtered information to the electronic device in a format as transferred to the information transmission system” and as included in the combination of steps

of claim 23 as amended. Janakiraman et al. teaches extracting text equivalents for multimedia content and streaming them to a web browser. Jamtgaard et al. teaches converting data from an internet provider's website to a format that is customized to an information appliance 15 (see Jamtgaard et al., col. 4, lines 58-66). Thus, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest "wirelessly transmitting the filtered information to the electronic device in a format as transferred to the information transmission system" as included in the combination of steps of claim 23 as amended. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 25, 29-30, and 32-33 depend from claim 23 and are thus patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. and Jamtgaard et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 23, and Applicants further request that the rejection of claims 25, 29-30, and 32-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn as well.

**iii Claims 35, 38 and 41-44**

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the steps of claim 35 as combined therein. Specifically, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. fails to teach or suggest "wirelessly transmitting only compatible data to the electronic device, wherein the compatible data is transmitted in the same format in which it was gathered" as included in the combination of steps of claim 35 as amended. Janakiraman et al. teaches extracting text equivalents for multimedia content and streaming them to a web browser. Jamtgaard et al. teaches converting data from an internet provider's website to a format that is customized to an information appliance 15 (see Jamtgaard et al., col. 4, lines 58-66). Thus, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest "wirelessly transmitting only compatible data to the electronic device, wherein the compatible data is transmitted in the same format in which it was gathered" as included in the combination of steps of claim 35 as amended. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 38 and 41-44 depend from claim 35 and are

thus patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. and Jamtgaard et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 35, and Applicants further request that the rejection of claims 38 and 41-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn as well.

**iv Claims 46, 48 and 51**

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the steps of claim 46 as combined therein.

Specifically, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. fails to teach or suggest “transmitting to the electronic device only portions of the data having a supported data format as gathered” as included in the combination of steps of claim 46 as amended.

Janakiraman et al. teaches extracting text equivalents for multimedia content and streaming them to a web browser. Jamtgaard et al. teaches converting data from an internet provider’s website to a format that is customized to an information appliance 15 (see Jamtgaard et al., col. 4, lines 58-66). Thus, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest “transmitting to the electronic device only portions of the data having a supported data format as gathered” as included in the combination of steps of claim 46 as amended.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 48 and 51 depend from claim 46 and are thus patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. and Jamtgaard et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 46, and Applicants further request that the rejection of claims 48 and 51 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn as well.

**v. Claims 53 and 56-59**

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the steps of claim 53 as combined therein.

Specifically, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. fails to teach or suggest “wirelessly transmitting the requested data to the portable electronic device only if it has a supported format as received” as included in the combination of steps of claim 53 as

amended. Janakiraman et al. teaches extracting text equivalents for multimedia content and streaming them to a web browser. Jamtgaard et al. teaches converting data from an internet provider's website to a format that is customized to an information appliance 15 (see Jamtgaard et al., col. 4, lines 58-66). Thus, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest "wirelessly transmitting the requested data to the portable electronic device only if it has a supported format as received" as included in the combination of steps of claim 53 as amended. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 56-59 depend from claim 53 and are thus patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. and Jamtgaard et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 53, and Applicants further request that the rejection of claims 56-59 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn as well.

**vi. Claims 61-62 and 64-65**

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the steps of claim 61 as combined therein. Specifically, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. fails to teach or suggest "wirelessly transmitting the electronic information to the portable electronic device only if the information as received by the proxy server is compatible with the loaded plug-ins" as included in the combination of steps of claim 61 as amended. Janakiraman et al. teaches extracting text equivalents for multimedia content and streaming them to a web browser. Jamtgaard et al. teaches converting data from an internet provider's website to a format that is customized to an information appliance 15 (see Jamtgaard et al., col. 4, lines 58-66). Thus, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest "wirelessly transmitting the electronic information to the portable electronic device only if the information as received by the proxy server is compatible with the loaded plug-ins" as included in the combination of steps of claim 61 as amended. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 61 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 62 and 64-65 depend from claim 53 and are thus patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al.

and Jamtgaard et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 53, and Applicants further request that the rejection of claims 62 and 64-65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn as well.

**vii. Claims 67-69, 71, 73, and 78-80**

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 67 as combined therein. Specifically, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. fails to teach or suggest “means for filtering the electronic data to transmit only compatible electronic data in a format as provided by the electronic data source location” as included in the combination of elements of claim 67 as amended. Janakiraman et al. teaches extracting text equivalents for multimedia content and streaming them to a web browser. Jamtgaard et al. teaches converting data from an internet provider’s website to a format that is customized to an information appliance 15 (see Jamtgaard et al., col. 4, lines 58-66). Thus, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest “means for filtering the electronic data to transmit only compatible electronic data in a format as provided by the electronic data source location” as included in the combination of elements of claim 67 as amended. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 67 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 68-69, 71, 73, and 78-80 depend from claim 67 and are thus patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. and Jamtgaard et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 67, and Applicants further request that the rejection of claims 68-69, 71, 73, and 78-80 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn as well.

**viii. Claims 81-82**

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 81 as combined therein. Specifically, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. fails to teach or suggest “means for wirelessly transmitting electronic information to the electronic device only if the electronic information has a supported file type as transferred to the proxy server” as

included in the combination of elements of claim 81 as amended. Janakiraman et al. teaches extracting text equivalents for multimedia content and streaming them to a web browser. Jamtgaard et al. teaches converting data from an internet provider's website to a format that is customized to an information appliance 15 (see Jamtgaard et al., col. 4, lines 58-66). Thus, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest "means for wirelessly transmitting electronic information to the electronic device only if the electronic information has a supported file type as transferred to the proxy server" as included in the combination of elements of claim 81 as amended. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 81 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Additionally, claim 82 depends from claim 81 and is thus patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. and Jamtgaard et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 81, and Applicants further request that the rejection of claim 82 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn as well.

**ix. Claims 86, 88-90, and 93-94**

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 86 as combined therein. Specifically, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. fails to teach or suggest "means for transmitting the filtered electronic data in a format provided by the remote resource from the data transmission system to the portable electronic device" as included in the combination of elements of claim 86 as amended. Janakiraman et al. teaches extracting text equivalents for multimedia content and streaming them to a web browser. Jamtgaard et al. teaches converting data from an internet provider's website to a format that is customized to an information appliance 15 (see Jamtgaard et al., col. 4, lines 58-66). Thus, the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest "means for transmitting the filtered electronic data in a format provided by the remote resource from the data transmission system to the portable electronic device" as included in the combination of elements of claim 86 as amended. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 86 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 88-90 and 93-94 depend from claim 86 and

are thus patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. and Jamtgaard et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 86, and Applicants further request that the rejection of claims 88-90 and 93-94 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn as well.

**b. Rejection of claims 5-6, 19, 26-27, 39-40, 49-50, 63, 74-75, 83-84, and 91-92 based on Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. and further in view of Adachi.**

In section 23 of the Office Action, claims 5-6, 19, 26-27, 39-40, 49-50, 63, 74-75, 83-84, and 91-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. and further in view of Adachi (U.S. Patent No. 6,877,037). Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claims 5-6, 19, 26-27, 39-40, 49-50, 63, 74-75, 83-84, and 91-92. To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art (see M.P.E.P. § 2143.03). Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., and Adachi fails to teach or suggest at least one limitation of each of claims 5-6, 19, 26-27, 39-40, 49-50, 63, 74-75, 83-84, and 91-92.

**i. Claims 5-6 and 19**

Claims 5-6 and 19 depend from claim 1. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 1. As to Adachi, it does not appear to make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. Thus, claims 5-6 and 19 are believed to be patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., and Adachi for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 5-6 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**ii. Claims 26-27**

Claims 26-27 depend from claim 23. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest the subject matter of



claim 23. As to Adachi, it does not appear to make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. Thus, claims 26-27 are believed to be patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., and Adachi for at least the same reasons as claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**iii. Claims 39-40**

Claims 39-40 depend from claim 35. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 35. As to Adachi, it does not appear to make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. Thus, claims 39-40 are believed to be patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., and Adachi for at least the same reasons as claim 35. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 39-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**iv. Claims 49-50**

Claims 49-50 depend from claim 46. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 46. As to Adachi, it does not appear to make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. Thus, claims 49-50 are believed to be patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., and Adachi for at least the same reasons as claim 46. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 49-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**v. Claim 63**

Claim 63 depends from claim 61. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 61. As to Adachi, it does not appear to make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies in the cited

combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. Thus, claim 63 is believed to be patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., and Adachi for at least the same reasons as claim 61. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 63 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**vi. Claims 74-75**

Claims 74-75 depend from claim 67. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 67. As to Adachi, it does not appear to make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. Thus, claims 74-75 are believed to be patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., and Adachi for at least the same reasons as claim 67. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 74-75 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**vii. Claims 83-84**

Claims 83-84 depend from claim 81. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 81. As to Adachi, it does not appear to make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. Thus, claims 83-84 are believed to be patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., and Adachi for at least the same reasons as claim 81. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 83-84 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**viii. Claims 91-92**

Claims 91-92 depend from claim 86. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 86. As to Adachi, it does not appear to make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. Thus, claims 91-92 are

believed to be patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., and Adachi for at least the same reasons as claim 86. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 91-92 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**c. Rejection of claims 95-96 based on Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. and further in view of Adachi, and further in view of Schwartz et al.**

In section 27 of the Office Action, claims 95-96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. and further in view of Adachi and further in view of Schwartz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,473,609). Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claims 95-96. To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art (see M.P.E.P. § 2143.03). Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., Adachi, and Schwartz et al. fails to teach or suggest at least one limitation of each of claims 95-96.

Claims 95-96 depend from claim 92. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. and further in view of Adachi does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 92. As to Schwartz et al., it does not appear to make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. and further in view of Adachi. Thus, claims 95-96 are believed to be patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., Adachi, and Schwartz et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 92. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 95-96 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**d. Rejection of claims 20-22, 34, 45, 52, 60, 66, 76-77, and 85 based on Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. and further in view of Schwartz et al.**

In section 30 of the Office Action, claims 20-22, 34, 45, 52, 60, 66, 76-77, and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakiraman et al. in view of

Schwartz et al. Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claims 20-22, 34, 45, 52, 60, 66, 76-77, and 85. To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art (see M.P.E.P. § 2143.03). Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., and Schwartz et al. fails to teach or suggest at least one limitation of each of claims 20-22, 34, 45, 52, 60, 66, 76-77, and 85.

**i. Claims 20-22**

Claims 20-22 depend from claim 1. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 1. As to Schwartz et al., it does not appear to make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. Thus, claims 20-22 are believed to be patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., and Schwartz et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**ii. Claim 34**

Claim 34 depends from claim 23. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 23. As to Schwartz et al., it does not appear to make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. Thus, claim 34 is believed to be patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., and Schwartz et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**iii. Claim 45**

Claim 45 depends from claim 35. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 35. As to

Schwartz et al., it does not appear to make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. Thus, claim 45 is believed to be patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., and Schwartz et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 35. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**iv. Claim 52**

Claim 52 depends from claim 46. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 46. As to Schwartz et al., it does not appear to make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. Thus, claim 52 is believed to be patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., and Schwartz et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 46. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**v. Claim 60**

Claim 60 depends from claim 53. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 53. As to Schwartz et al., it does not appear to make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. Thus, claim 60 is believed to be patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., and Schwartz et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 53. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 60 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**vi. Claim 66**

Claim 66 depends from claim 61. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 61. As to Schwartz et al., it does not appear to make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies in the cited

combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. Thus, claim 66 is believed to be patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., and Schwartz et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 61. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 66 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**vii. Claims 76-77**

Claims 76-77 depend from claim 67. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 67. As to Schwartz et al., it does not appear to make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. Thus, claims 76-77 are believed to be patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., and Schwartz et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 67. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 76-77 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**viii. Claim 85**

Claim 85 depends from claim 81. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 81. As to Schwartz et al., it does not appear to make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. Thus, claim 85 is believed to be patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., and Schwartz et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 81. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 85 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**e. Rejection of claims 28, 31, 36, 54, 70, and 87 based on Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. and further in view of Timothy et al.**

In section 35 of the Office Action, claims 28, 31, 36, 54, 70, and 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. and further in view of Timothy et al. (“Web Page Filtering and Re-Authoring for Mobile Users”). Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case of

obviousness with respect to claims 28, 31, 36, 54, 70, and 87. To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art (see M.P.E.P. § 2143.03). Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., and Timothy et al. fails to teach or suggest at least one limitation of each of claims 28, 31, 36, 54, 70, and 87.

**i. Claims 28 and 31**

Claims 28 and 31 depend from claim 23. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 23. As to Timothy et al., it does not appear to make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. Thus, claims 28 and 31 are believed to be patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., and Timothy et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 28 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**ii. Claim 36**

Claim 36 depends from claim 35. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 35. As to Timothy et al., it does not appear to make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. Thus, claim 36 is believed to be patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., and Timothy et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 35. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**iii. Claim 54**

Claim 54 depends from claim 53. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 53. As to Timothy et al., it does not appear to make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies in the cited

combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. Thus, claim 54 is believed to be patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., and Timothy et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 53. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**iv. Claim 70**

Claim 70 depends from claim 67. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 67. As to Timothy et al., it does not appear to make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. Thus, claim 70 is believed to be patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., and Timothy et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 67. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 70 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**v. Claim 87**

Claim 87 depends from claim 86. As explained above, the combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 86. As to Timothy et al., it does not appear to make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies in the cited combination of Janakiraman et al. in view of Jamtgaard et al. Thus, claim 87 is believed to be patentable over the cited combination of Janakiraman et al., Jamtgaard et al., and Timothy et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 86. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 87 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.



The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 2/21/2006

By Chad E. Bement

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 26371  
Telephone: (414) 297-5554  
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Chad E. Bement  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 54,991